

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 145038/FH/2026
Date registered valid: 27 January 2026
Proposal: Erection of single-storey rear extension following removal of existing structure to rear.
Address: 35 Benmore Road, Manchester, M9 6LQ
Ward(s): Charlestown Ward

Applicant: Mr Abdul Naeem Dar
Agent (if any): Mr Belal Rashid, BRTA Limited
Case officer: Ciara Gettinby
Tel: 0161 234 3048
Email: ciara.gettinby@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 13 March 2026

Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 4 March 2026

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 3 February 2026 Expired: 24 February 2026

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The property that is subject of this householder application is a semi-detached C3, two-storey dwellinghouse. The property features red brickwork, white uPVC window frames and red roof tiles. To the front of the property is an area of soft landscaping and a hardstanding driveway. To the rear of the property is a structure which is being used as an outdoor kitchen. The rear garden also features an outbuilding.

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

Benmore Road is a residential street situated in the Charlestown Ward of Manchester. The property is surrounded by similar built family properties of a similar design and age. The street and surrounding area benefits from nearby green infrastructure such as, Boggart Hole Clough and Bailey's Wood. The area also benefits from nearby sustainable transport links, and the area is well connected to the City Centre through multiple bus routes.

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single-storey rear extension.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Neighbours, as per appendix 1- no comments or objections.

POLICY

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application:

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)- The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan, but certain policies are still considered relevance:

-Policy DC1- Residential Extensions

The Manchester Core Strategy- Development Plan Document 2012- 2027 (The Core Strategy) was adopted by the City Council on the 11th of July 2012, it is a key document for the local plan which provides a framework that planning applications are assessed against.

Policy DM1- Development Management

Policy SP1- Spatial Principles

Policy EN19- Waste

The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2025)- The Government's own planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied.

-Chapter 8- Promoting healthy and safe communities

-Chapter 12- Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

The DRAFT National Planning Policy Framework (December 2025)- The Government's new national planning policies and how they are to be implemented through local authorities. Whilst this is a draft NPPF for consultation it is considered that the development proposals are in accordance with the general thrust of policy contained within it.

Achieving sustainable development

Policy S3- Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy S4- Principle of development within settlements

Achieving well-designed places

Policy DP3- Key principles for well-designed places

Policy DP4- The design process

Places for Everyone- Along term plan of nine Greater Manchester districts for jobs, new homes and sustainable growth, it has been published by the GMCA on behalf of the nine districts (Bolton, Bury, Rochdale, Oldham, Tameside, Stockport, Manchester, Trafford, Salford, Wigan) and took into effect and become part of the statutory development plan on March 21, 2024.

-Policy JP-P1: Sustainable Places

Issues

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy seeks to ensure that any new built development enhance or creates character, meets local needs and enhances the built environment and its design, scale and appearance of the proposed development that is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1, DC1.2 and DC1.3 of the UDP for the City of Manchester relate specifically to residential extensions and set out several criteria against which proposals for extension will be assessed. Although the latter policies are of age, they are of

long-established practice with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks a high standard of design in new developments to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future residents.

Principle

The principle of erecting a single storey rear extension for additional living accommodation is acceptable given that many individuals prefer to extend and alter their homes to meet changing household needs rather than move. Residents' homes should enable growth by providing sufficient space to accommodate changing needs and circumstances. However, consideration must be given to the proposal siting scale and massing, appearance and impact upon visual amenity, residential amenity, waste storage and parking.

Planning History

No relevant planning history.

Siting Scale and Massing

The rear extension would project backwards from the host dwellinghouse by approx. 3.6m and would expand 7.4m across the rear of the property. The rearward projection of the extension does not exceed the limit stipulated within the saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (3.65m.) The extension proposes a roof height of 3.5m sloping down to meet the eaves at 2.7m. The proposal proposes a mono-pitched roof which would ensure that the mass and bulk of the proposal is contained onto the applicant property. The extension would be set back from the adjoining neighbour by approx. 0.3m. The extension would propose the addition of three new doors and one window all to face into the applicant's rear garden. No windows are proposed on the side elevation of the property.

As existing, there is a temporary structure which projects backwards from the dwellinghouse by approx. 4m and extends along the rear of the property by 7.7m.

The overall siting scale and massing of the proposal is acceptable as the extension is understood as being subservient to the host dwellinghouse and given the remaining amenity space, is considered to be acceptable in this instance. The proposal is not considered to cause undue harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of introducing an overbearing feature into the area. The proposed location plan demonstrates the private outdoor amenity space that would be retained to the rear.

Residential Amenity

The adjoining neighbour, no. 33 Benmore Road sits south of the applicant property. As existing, the temporary structure to the rear of the property has decreased the openness of the shared boundary. Therefore, the introduction of the extension would have less of an impact on the boundary as it would be slightly set back and have a smaller rear projection. No windows are proposed to face towards the neighbouring property and therefore the existing levels of privacy would remain the same. Additionally, due to the orientation of the sun, the extension would not cause any additional overshadowing onto the neighbouring property. Overall, the proposed development is not considered to introduce an overbearing feature into the area and would not cause any significant residential amenity implications.

The non-adjoining neighbour, no. 37 Benmore Road sits north of the applicant property. The existing presence of the structure would reduce the impact of the extension upon the neighbouring properties. The extension is not considered to introduce any windows that would face towards the neighbouring property and therefore the existing levels of privacy would be retained. The extension would be considered an improvement to what is existing, as it reduces the bulk of the temporary structure as it would be 1m less in projection. The extension is not considered to contribute to any significant overshadowing for the neighbouring properties and

would not be considered an overbearing structure. Considering the permitted development fallback, the proposal is considered acceptable.

Given the above reasons and considering there has been no objections received, the proposed extension should not give issues associated with overshadowing, loss of light, or loss of outlook, nor should it introduce an overbearing presence into the area. The proposal therefore accords with saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and Policies SM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Visual Amenity

The submitted application form indicates that the extension would be built with matching materials to the original dwellinghouse. The extension would utilise matching red brick, matching roof tiles and white uPVC glazed windows/ doors. The use of matching materials would ensure that the overall character of this property and its surrounding area should not be significantly harmed by these works. The extension would not be visible from the street scene and therefore would not be visible from the street scene. Overall, the proposal is considered a small addition to the development within the street. The development would not be out of place for the character of the street as many other residents have benefitted from planning permission. The design and appearance of the extension therefore accord with saved Policy DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The development would be considered an improvement to the existing structure and would improve the overall appearance of the dwellinghouse. The extension is not considered excessively large or bulky in pursuant with Policy DC1.2. The submitted site plan demonstrates that sufficient private outdoor amenity space would be retained to the rear, and the parking provision would be maintained. A materials condition has been attached to ensure that materials are adhered to pursuant with the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document Policies SP1 and DM1 and saved policies DC1 of the UDP.

Waste Storage and Parking

The proposal would not affect the existing parking arrangements to the front of the property and would not affect the current bin storage arrangements. The extension would not pass the existing side building line and would therefore not interfere in wheeling bins back and forth from the side of the property to the front.

Conclusion

Given the above issues, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its principle, siting scale and massing, appearance, impact upon visual and residential amenity, waste storage and parking as it broadly complies with saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, Policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and chapter 8 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone joint development plan document.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality

Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations

This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. No significant problems have arisen during the consideration of this application, and the applicant has been determined in a timely manner, in accordance with the policies in the development plan.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

- (1) The development must have begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of permission. Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1990.
- (2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents:

Proposed and plans, layouts and elevations

Location plan

Proposed block plan of the site

Received on 27 January 2026

Reason- to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to saved policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

- (3) The materials used in the walls, roof or other element of any exterior work of the development hereby approved shall be similar in appearance to the materials used in the

majority of the equivalent element of the existing building, in terms of type, size, colour and texture.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

If the development can accommodate it, it is requested that consideration is given to the installation of Swift Bricks. Swift bricks must be fitted in accordance to the specifications of BS 42021:2022 - Integral nest boxes.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

37 Benmore Road, Manchester, M9 6LQ
12 Bloxham Walk, Manchester, M9 6EQ
43 Benmore Road, Manchester, M9 6LQ
41 Benmore Road, Manchester, M9 6LQ
39 Benmore Road, Manchester, M9 6LQ
33 Benmore Road, Manchester, M9 6LQ
14 Bloxham Walk, Manchester, M9 6EQ

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA